# THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

# SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

*A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.*

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

**VOL. II.** } **MADRAS, SEPTEMBER 1898.** { **No. 4.**


## TRANSLATIONS.

### THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 54.)

**Adhikarana 4.**

The next adhikarana proceeds to show that the Parames'vara, who has been proved to be the all-destroyer in the adhikarana just closed, is ever associated with Jîvas, the manifestations of His own glory, as declared in the following passage:

> "Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating."*

**Those who entered into the cave are verily the two Atmans, because so it is seen. (I. ii. 11).**

The passage to be discussed in this adhikarana runs as follows:

> "There are the two, drinking their rewards in the world of their own works, entered into the cave (of the heart), dwelling on the highest summit (the ether in the heart). Those who know Brahman call them shade and light; likewise those householders who perform the Trinâchiketa sacrifice.'*

Here two beings are spoken of, as distinct from each other as shade and light, those two who have entered into the cave of the heart in the body of a brâhman or other person,—which is spoken of as 'the world of their own works' and as 'the highest summit,'—and who are the eaters of the fruits of works. A doubt arises as to whether these two are Buddhi and Jîva, or Jîva and Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The two are none other than Buddhi and Jîva.—Why?—Because the words "drinking the rewards" show that the two are enjoyers. Parames'vara is not an enjoyer, because we find it said that "the other looks on without eating." It is a well-known fact that Buddhi and Jîva are enjoyers. Moreover, there exists no such thorough distinction between Jîva and I's'vara who are both sentient, as between shade and light. Buddhi being insentient,

*S'vetàsvatara-Upanishad 4—6.

* Katha-Upanishad 3—1.

there is a distinction between Buddhi and Jîva. Thus Buddhi and Jîva are the two beings spoken of here.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: the two beings who lie in the cave are none other than Jîva and Parames'vara, because we find it said that they have entered into the cave in the following passage:

"Him who is difficult to be seen, who has entered into the dark, who is hidden in the cave, who dwells in the abyss, who is the ancient."*

As to the contention that I's'vara is not an enjoyer, it is wrong to say so; for, the words "whose delight is in prâna, whose bliss is in manas" show that even Brahman who delights in A'tman is in the enjoyment of His own inherent bliss which is accessible to manas alone. The Purâna also says.

"He is a youth who delights in the joy arising from the tasting of the nectar of His own S'akti; who as a rule tastes only the sweet honey of the supreme infinite bliss."

Every one knows that Jîva is the eater of the fruits of his own Karma. Though we are thus told that the two are alike enjoyers, a distinction has to be made in accordance with the nature of the two enjoyers. When, for instance, we say 'the king and his servant eat food' we mean that each eats that kind of food which is suited to his rank.

As to the contention that there is no distinction between them, we cannot assent to it; for, though the passage "the eternal of the eternal ones, and the sentient of the sentient ones" †declares the equality of Jîva and I's'vara in so far as they are eternal and sentient, there still exists a distinction between them caused by the existence of beginningless *mala* (original sin) in Jîva and its absence in the other. The S'ruti "there are two, one knowing and the other unknowing, both unborn, one strong and the other weak"‡ declares that there is a distinction caused by knowledge and ignorance, by independence and dependence and such other attributes.

(*Objection*):—While both of them are alike associated with a body, how is it that one of them is afflicted with ignorance and other evils while the other is untouched by any evil?

(*Answer*):—There is no room for any such objection. Their occupation of the same body has nothing to do with the blissful condition of the one or the miserable condition of the other. On the other hand it is the independence of the I's'vara that makes Him blissful, and it is the dependence of Jîva that makes him miserable. Accordingly the S'ruti says:

"On the same tree man sits grieving, immersed, bewildered, by his own impotence. But when he sees the other, the Lord, contented, and knows His glory, then his grief passes away."

The traditional interpretation of this passages is given as follows: The Jîva bound by the shackles of beginningless Karma, having entered into many a body made of Mâyâ—each suited to the enjoying of a particular fruit—is subjected to a lot of incurable misery; and unable to ward it off on account of his impotence, he does not know what to do and grieves. He is thus immersed in the ocean of grief caused by his great delusion. When, however, by the Lord's Grace he intuitively sees Him who as the Impeller dwells within himself, who is gracious to all, who is ever associated with Umâ, then he attains to the unsurpassed greatness of the Lord, free from all grief. Wherefore though S'iva, who is independent and who has been free from samsâra from time without a beginning, is in contact with the body, he is not subject to its evils as the Jîva is. Wherefore it is Jîva and Parames'vara that are said to lie in the cave of the heart.

The Sûtrakâra again explains:

**And because of the specific attribute. (I. ii. 12.),**

Moreover, in this section of the upanishad, Jîva and Parames'vara are specifically described. Jîva is described as follows: "The knower is not born, nor does he die,"† and so on. The Parames'vara is described as "smaller than small, greater than great."‡ How can this specific description apply to Jîva and Buddhi? Hence the conclusion that it is Jîva and the Parames'vara that have entered into the cave of the heart and dwell therein as the impelled and the Impeller, as the body and the Embodied.

## Adhikarana 5.

Here will be mentioned another place for worshipping Parames'vara who has been shewn to be the object of worship dwelling in the cave of the heart.

**(Parames'vara is the Being) who is within (the eye) because (to Him the attributes are) applicable. (I. ii. 13).**

The subject-matter of discussion in this section occurs in a passage of the Chhândogya-Upanishad, which reads as follows:

* Katha - Upaniashad. 2 12.
† Katha -Upnishad 5-13.
‡ Svetâsvatara-Upanishad 1-9.

* Mundaka - Upanishad. 3-1.
† Katha - Upanishad. 2-18.
‡ Ibid. 2-20.

"The person that is seen in the eye, that is the Atman. This is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman."*

Now, who is the person within the eye spoken of as 'the immortal' etc? Is he the I's'vara or some other being?

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—Such a doubt arising, we hold that he is a being other than the Parames'vara; for, in the Mahânârâyanopanishad 10, 11 etc., the Parames'vara is spoken of as dwelling only in the heart-lotus. On the other hand, Jîva enters into the organ of sight when perceiving colour etc., in virtue of his connection with the manas. He is the person in the eye. Or, it may be the reflected person.

(*Siddhânta*) :—As against the foregoing *prima facie* view we explain as follows: It is the Parames'vara Himself who is spoken of as the person in the eye; for, to Him alone are applicable such attributes as immortality and fearlessness in their absolute sense.

As to the contention that the I's'vara is nowhere spoken of as dwelling in the eye, the Sûtrakâra says:

**And because He is declared to be seated and so on. (I. ii. 14.)**

I's'vara is declared to be seated in the eye and to rule it within, in such passages as the following:

"He who dwells in the eye, and within the eye, whom the eye does not know, whose body the eye is, and who rules the eye within, he is thy Atman, the ruler within, the immortal."†

Wherefore it is verily the Supreme I's'vara.

The Sûtrakara now proceeds to show an incongruity in case it is held that the reflected image of the person is spoken of in the passage referred to:

**And verily because of the declaration that he is endued with bliss. (I. ii. 15.)**

The person referred to is the I's'vara for the very reason that he is declared to be endued with bliss in a former passage which runs as follows:

"Bliss is Brahman, âkâsa is Brahman."‡

Indeed no bliss can exist in the reflected image of a person.

As to the contention that the person in the eye is the Jîva, the Sûtrakâra says:

**And for that very reason he is Brahman. (I. ii. 16.)**

Because to Upakosala who was afraid of samsâra, and sought to know Brahman the s'ruti beginning with the passage "Bliss is Brahman, âkâsa is Brahman," teaches that "what verily is bliss, that verily is the âkâsa and what verily is the âkâsa, that verily is bliss,"* therefore the âkâsa spoken of as "Kha" is none other than Brahman. Is there any such appropriateness in the case of Jîva? Indeed in Jîva there cannot exist the absolute bliss. Wherefore, the very Brahman who has been spoken of in the opening passage as the infinite bliss being afterwards declared to be the person seated in the eye, Parames'vara is the being spoken of as the person in the eye.

In the Pûrvapaksha there is, moreover, an incongruity, as the Sûtrakâra says:

**And because of the mention of the path of those who have learned the Divine Wisdom. (I. ii. 17.)**

Because the s'ruti which begins with the words "He goes to light, from light to day" and ends with the words "there is a person not human; he leads them to Brahman; this is the path of the Devas, the path that leads to Brahman; those who proceed on that path do not return to the life of man, yea, they do not return;"* teaches, in connection with him who has known of the 'person in the eye,' the path of *light* etc., —the path which has to be learnt by those who have known of the nature of Brahman,—therefore, the person spoken of is neither Jîva nor the reflected image in the eye; on the other hand, he is none other than the I's'vara.

---

### Adhikarana 6.

**Owing to looseness and impossibility, not the other. (I. ii. 18.)**

The passage which has to be discussed here occurs in the Mahopanishad and reads as follows:

"The thumb-sized Purusha, seated in the thumb, the Lord, the Master of the whole world, the eater of the whole, is pleased.†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as 'thumb-sized' and so on is the Parames'vara or some one else.

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—Inasmuch as this passage occurs in the section of *Prânâgnihotra*, and because the Purusha is spoken of as small—by the epithet 'thumb-sized'—we have to understand that it is Prâna or the Vital air which is the eater of the five oblations. And

---

* Op. Cit. 4-15.

† Brih. Up. 5-7.

‡ Chhandogya Upanishad 4-10.

* Chhandogya Upanishad 4-10, 15.

† Op. Cit. 35.

it cannot be urged that Prâna cannot be the eater; for, even the air is spoken of as an eater in such passages as the following:

"The waters and the earth are the food, and the fire and the air are the eaters."

From all points of view the passage refers to the vital air.

(*Siddhânta*):—It is none other than Parames'vara who is spoken of here; for, if the attribute of lordship over the whole universe and that of being the eater of the whole be (somehow) applied to the other (Prâna), then these attributes are too loosely applied.* These attributes cannot be strictly applied to it (prâna). Wherefore none but I's'vara can be such a being. He is declared to be an object of worship even in the form of prâna, as the s'ruti speaks of Him as the seat of prâna in the following words:

"Thou art the knot of all prânas (senses),
Thou art Rudra, the destroyer (of pain); do
Thou enter into me."†

As to His being spoken of as "thumb-sized," there can be no inconsistency, inasmuch as He is so described only for the purpose of meditation. Though the vital air is found described in several places as the eater, it cannot be 'the eater of the *whole*.' Accordingly we should understand that the I's'vara is here described to be of the form of prâna and has to be worshipped by Prânâgnihotra.

### Adhikarana. 7.

For the purpose of contemplative worship, it has been shown that S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, is seated in the orb of the sun, in man's heart-lotus, and so on, though He is all-knowing, all-powerful, all-benign, and all-pervading. This section proceeds to shew that He is seated everywhere.

**(He is) the Inner Ruler abiding in the Devas, in the worlds and so on, because of the mention of His attributes. (I. ii. 19).**

The text which forms the subject of discussion in this section occurs in the Antaryâmi-Brâhmana and runs as follows:

"He who dwells in the earth, within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, and who rules the earth within, he is thy A'tman, the ruler within, the immortal."‡

* That is, they become applicable to many other entities.

† Mâhânârayana Upanishad 37.

‡ Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad 5—7.

A doubt arises as to whether he who is thus spoken of as the Inner Ruler in all beings,—in all things mentioned in the series extending from earth up to A'tman,—is the Parames'vara, or Jîva, or the Virât-Purusha, or the Pradhâna.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—It becomes only Jîva to enter into the sense-organs of all beings for the enjoying of the variegated fruits which he has earned. It becomes the Virat-Purusha to enter into all beings, as he is the upâdâna (material cause) of all sentient existence. Or, it is right to maintain that it is the Pradhâna which pervades all, as it becomes transformed in the form of the *mahat* and so on. It cannot be that the Parames'vara who, as superior to the universe, is declared in the s'ruti to have crossed beyond all phenomenal existence (vikâra) has entered into the universe of phenomenal forms. Wherefore the *Antaryâmin*, the Inner Ruler, must be one of the three mentioned above,—Jîva, Virât-purusha, or Pradhâna,—but not the Parames'vara.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: He who is described to be the Antaryâmin, the Inner Ruler in the earth and so on, is none but Parames'vara, because of the mention of the attribute of being within all and the like. In the Atharvas'iras also the Parames'vara is found described to have entered into all beings as their A'tman. In the words "He is thy A'tman, the ruler within, the immortal," S'iva alone is described as immortal and liberated from time without beginning, it being said in the Jâbâla-Upanishad that "these are verily the designations of the Immortal." Just as the Parames'vara is described in the s'ruti as superior to the universe, He is also described as all-formed in the words "all verily is Rudra," and so on. In every subsequent passage of the section (following the one quoted in the opening part of the adhikarana from the Brihadâranyaka-upanishad) the word 'immortal' is used evidently to show that He is not in the least tinged with the phenomenal change though He is present in all changing phenomena. In that section of the Atharvas'iras which begins with the passage "He verily who is Rudra is the Blessed Lord; He is Bhûh, Bhuvah, Suvah, as well as he who is known as Brahmâ; to Him, verily, we bow, we bow," the Parames'vara is described as Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Umâ, Laksmî, Sarasvatî, Ganes'a, Skanda, Indra, and other guardian spirits of the world, the seven worlds comprising the earth etc., the five material elements comprising earth etc., the sun, the moon, the planets;

the stars, time and so on,—in each case repeating in its turn) all that has been said when describing Him as Brahmâ in the opening passage of the section here quoted.). And even here, with a view to prevent the notion that owing to His entrance into all sentient and insentient existence He may become tainted with evil, the word "Bhagavat" (blessed Lord) has been used in each case, thus showing that He is always endued with the excellent divine attributes of lordship and so on. Wherefore it is but right to hold that S'iva, the Supreme Lord, is superior to all and is the A'tman of all.

As to the contention that Pradhâna etc. may be spoken of as the Antaryâmin, the sûtrakâra refutes it as follows:

**And not what the smriti speaks of, there being no mention of its attributes; nor is it the embodied. (I. ii. 20).**

And we cannot hold that what the s'ruti speaks of as Antaryâmin, the Inner Ruler, is the Pradhâna mentioned in the smriti (of the Sânkhyas), there being no mention of its attributes, such as changeability, inertness and so on. Nor can the embodied Virât-Purusha be the being here referred to, inasmuch as he cannot be the ruler of all.

And it is not Jîva either:

**Both alike, verily, declare Him as different. (I, ii. 21).**

Both the schools, the Kânvas as well as the Mâdhyandinas, declare the Antaryâmin as different from the Jîva, in the words "He who abides in the vijñâna," and "He who abides in the A'tman," and so on. Wherefore it may be concluded that Parames'vara is alone the Inner Ruler of all, not the Pradhâna, nor Virât-Purusha, nor Jîva.

### Adhikarana 8.

This adhikarana is introduced with a view to shew that the Parames'vara, who has been declared to be embodied in the visible forms of the earth etc., is not Himself visible like them.

**(Parames'vara is the being) possessed of the attributes of invisibility and so on, because of the mention of (His) attributes. (I. ii. 22.)**

The passage which forms the subject of discussion in this adhikarana runs as follows:

"But the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructible (Akshara) is apprehended; that which cannot be seen, nor seized, which has no family and no caste, no eyes nor ears, no hands nor feet, the eternal, the omnipresent; infinitesimal, that which is imperishable,—it is that which the wise regard as the source of all beings.*



Here a doubt arises as to whether the indestructible (Akshara) refers to Pradhâna, Jîva, or Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Here Akshara refers to Pradhâna, inasmuch as it can be the source of all beings, transforming itself into *mahat* and so on. Or, Akshara may refer to jîva. He, can indeed, be rightly spoken of as Akshara, as said in the following passage of the s'ruti:

> "That which is perishable (Kshara), the Pradhâna, the immortal (amrita), the indestructible (âkshara)."†

He can be the source of all beings through his Karma. Wherefore Akshara may refer to one of the two.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The Akshara is none other than Parames'vara, His attributes being spoken of in the words "From Him who perceives all, and who knows all, whose penance (tapas) consists of knowledge"‡ and so on. Indeed, such attributes as omniscience can pertain to none other than Parames'vara. As to the contention that Pradhâna and Jîva can be the source of all beings, we say it is wrong to say so, inasmuch as they are (respectively) insentient and possessed of limited knowledge, and are therefore incapable of the act of (creating all beings).

Again, the Sûtrakâra proceeds to show that 'Akshara' cannot properly refer to Jîva and Pradhâna:

**And because of the mention of qualifications and a distinction, (it is) not the two others. (I. ii. 23).**

Here the Upanishad opens with the enunciation of the proposition that, one being known, all is known, in the words "Which one, O blessed Lord, being known, all this becomes known?"§ Besides this, there are other qualifications. Owing to a mention of such qualifications 'Akshara' cannot here mean Pradhâna. Neither does 'Akshara' refer to Jîva, inasmuch as the Akshara is described to be different from Jîva in the words "higher than the high, (higher) than the imperishable.¶

**And because of the description of (His) form (I. ii. 24.)**

The Akshara is described to be of the form of the three worlds in the following passage:

* Mundaka-Upanishad 1-1-5, 6.
† Svetasvatara-Upanishad 1-10.
‡ Mundaka-Upanishad 1-1. 9.
§ Ibid. 1-1-3.
¶ Ibid. 2-1-2.

"Fire is his head, his eyes the sun and the moon, the quarters his ears, his speech the Veda disclosed, the wind his breath, his heart the universe; from his feet came the earth, he is indeed the inner Atman of all beings."*

And for this reason, Parames'vara, the A'tman of all, is alone referred to by the word '*Akshara*.'

---

### Adhikarana 9.

It was shewn in a former section that Parames'vara is to be worshipped as the seat of prâna. This section proceeds to shew that He is to be worshipped as the fire in the stomach.

**The fire (Vais'va'nara is Parames'vara), because of the specification of the general designation. (I. ii. 25.)**

The following scriptural text forms the subject of discussion in this adhikarana:

"But he who worships the space-limited Vaisvânara A'tman as identical with himself, he eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all A'tmans.†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Vais'vânara here presented as an object of worship refers to Parames'vara, or to some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—The word 'Vais'vânara' denotes the fire in the stomach; for we find the word used to denote the fire in the stomach in the following passage:

"Agni Vais'vânara is the fire within man, by which the food that is eaten is cooked, *i. e.*, digested. Its noise is that which one hears, if one covers one's ears. When he is on the point of departing this life, he does not hear that noise."‡

Or it may refer to 'fire' the third of the five 'great elements,' the word 'Vais'vânara' being applied to fire in such passages as the following:

"This fire, verily, is the Vais'vânara."§

Or, the word may denote the god known by that name, inasmuch as he, as the god to be worshipped, is declared to be the giver of the reward in such passages as the following:

"When a son is born, oblations should be offered to the Vais'vânara in twelve cups."¶

It can never refer to Parames'vara, since the s'ruti teaches us that Vais'vânara is a finite being, in the words "space-limited.'

(*Siddhânta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Parames'vara Himself is referred to by the word 'Vais'vânara.'—How?—Though the word Vais'vânara' is a common designation, yet in this section of the upanishad it is defined by such specific designations as 'Brahman'—which are peculiarly applicable to Parames'vara,—in the following passages:

"Who is our A'tman? What is Brahman?"*

"You know at present that Vais'vânara A'tman; tell us that."

This specific designation cannot be applied to the fire in the stomach etc. Wherefore Vais'vânara is none but Parames'vara.

The Sûtrakâra adduces another piece of evidence to show that Parames'vara is meant here:

**Inasmuch as what is repeated may form a mark by which to infer. (I. ii. 26.)**

In such passages as "Fire is his head, his eyes the sun and the moon,"† Parames'vara is declared to be embodied in the form made up of the regions extending from heaven to earth. Such a form is spoken of in the section of the upanishad we are here discussing in the following words:

"Of that Vais'vânara A'tman, the head is Sutejas (having good light), the eye Vis'varûpa (multiform), the breath Prithagvartman (having various courses), the trunk Bahula (full), the bladder Rayi (wealth), the feet, the earth."‡

The form here spoken of forms the mark by which we may infer that Parames'vara is meant here.

**If (you hold it is) not (so) because by word etc. It is said to be established within, we cannot (grant it) because of its being so taught for the sake of contemplation, and on account of its incongruity; and, moreover, they declare him to be Purusha. (I. ii. 27.)**

(*Objection*):—This Vais'vânara fire is none other than the fire in the stomach, because of its being spoken of as the three fires and as the receptacle of the oblations offered to the prânas, in such passages as the following:

"The heart is the Gârhapatya fire, the mind the Anvâhârya fire, the mouth the A'havanîya fire.

*Ibid 2-1-1.
†Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-18.
‡Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad 7-9.
§ Taittiriya-Samhita 3-3-8.
¶Ibid 2-2-5.

* Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-11.
† Mundaka-Upanishad 2-1.
‡ Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-19.

Therefore the first food which a man may take is in the place of homa; *

and also because of its being declared to be established within man in the following passage:

"He who knows this Vais'vânara fire to be of the human form and established within man."†

The Vais'vânara fire is not Parames'vara.

(*Answer*) :—Not so; because it is taught that He has to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, and that it is impossible to hold that the fire in the stomach is of the form of the three worlds and so on. Moreover, in the words "this Vais'vânara fire is he who is known as Purusha," the Vâjasaneyins declare this Vais'vânara to be the Purusha. Moreover, none but Parames'vara can be strictly spoken of as Purusha, as the s'ruti says:

"By that Purusha all this is filled."‡

Wherefore it is right to hold that Parames'vara is meant here.

**Hence only, neither the God nor the element. (I. ii. 28.)**

Because this Vais'vânara has the three worlds for his body and is known by the name of Purusha, therefore neither the fire-god nor the third element (of fire) is meant here.

It having been proved that Parames'vara is denoted by the word 'agni' (fire) as having to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, the Sûtrakâra now proceeds to show how other teachers (âchâryas) have variously explained the application of the word 'agni.'

**Jaimini (sees) no incongruity even in literally (applying the word.) (I. ii. 29.)**

The application of the word 'agni' to Parames'vara is justifiable not merely on the ground that He has to be worshipped in the form of fire, but also on the ground that the word can be literally applied to Parames'vara himself as "leading (the devotees) to the front.' Thus Jaimini sees no incongruity in applying the word to Parames'vara.

* Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-18, 19.
† S'atapathabrahmana 10-6-1-11.
‡ Mahanarayana Upanishad 1.

**A's'marathya (holds it to be) for manifestation's sake! (I. ii. 30.)**

Sage A's'marathya holds that the Unlimited becomes limited in space occupied by the regions from the heaven down to the Earth, with a view to manifest Himself to his devotees.

**Badari (holds it to be) for recognition's sake, (I ii. 31.)**

Bâdari holds that the representation of the regions from the heaven to the earth as the head, feet and other parts of the body is meant for recognition, that is, for the attainment of Brahman.

**Jaimini (holds it to be) for exaltation's sake; so, indeed, (the sruti) reveals. (I. ii. 32.)**

Jaimini thinks that it is with a view to exalt in thought the oblations to prâna etc.—taught in connection with the worship—to the rank of an Agnihotra that the chest etc. of the worshipper are represented as the altar and so on in the following passage:

"The chest is the altar; the hairs, the grass on the altar; the heart, the Gârhapatya fire; the mind, the Anvâhârya fire; the mouth, the Ahavaîya fire."*

And accordingly the s'ruti says: "He who offers this Agnihotra with a full knowledge of its true purpose." †

**And they declare Him to be therein. (I. ii. 33.)**

The Taittirîyakas declare that the Parames'vara dwells in the devotee's body when oblations are offered to prâna etc., as the recipient of those oblations, as the following passages show:

"O oblation! enter into me as S'iva, that there may be no sensation of burning."‡

"The Lord is pleased, the eater of all."‡

Wherefore in the opinion of all teachers, as also in point of reason, it is right to hold that Parames'vara alone is to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, by the prâna-agnihotra.

*End of the Second Páda of the First Adhyâya.*

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Chhandogya-Upanishad. 5-18.
† Brihá—Up. 5-24.
‡ Mahânâ. Up. 33,36.

## TIRUMULAR'S TIRUMANTRAM.

(*Continued from page* 32).

### IN PRAISE OF THE VEDAS.

### வேதச் சிறப்பு.

வேதத்தை விட்ட வறமில்லை வேதத்தி
னோதத் தகுமற மெல்லா முளதர்க்க
வாதத்தை விட்டு மதிஞர் வளமுற்ற
வேதத்தை யோதியே வீடுபெற் றார்களே. (௧)

1. There is no Dharma outside the Vedas. All praiseworthy Dharmas are set forth in them. Leaving aside works on logic, the wise attained to Moksha, by the recitation of the Vedas.

வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதிய னாகிலன்
வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதா விளங்கிட
வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதியர் வேள்விக்காய்
வேத முரைத்தானு மெய்ப்பொருள் காட்டவே

2. He who recites the Vedas is not necessarily a brahmin, (unless he possesses the merits of one. The real author of the Vedas, He who taught the Vedas to Brahma himself, He who gave them out for the sacrificial rites of the brahmins, is the True Being, as demonstrated by the Vedas themselves.

இருக்குரு வாமெழில் வேதத்தி னுள்ளே
யுருக்குணர் வாயுணர் வேதத்து ளோங்கி
வெருக்குரு வாகிய வேதியர் சொல்லுங்
கருக் குரு வாய்நின்ற கண்ணனு மாமே. (௩)

3. In the beautiful laudatory verses of the Vedas, the Supreme Siva who is understood by the man of true love, is the True Being that is set forth and not the Black-hued Krishna who is belauded by catlike pretenders (*Vidala Brahmins*).

திருநெறி யாவது சித்தசித் தன்றிப்
பெருநெறி யாய பிரானை நினைந்து
குருநெறி யாஞ்சிவ மாநெறி கூடு
மொருநெறி யொன்றாக வேதாந்த மோதுமே.

4. The True Path, whereby the intelligent soul discriminating itself from Asat, and relying on its Lord who is the True Way, adheres to the teaching of its Guru regarding 'Sivoham' doctrine, is the one marga set forth by *Vedanta*.

ஆறங்க மாய்வரு மாமறை யோதியைக்
கூறங்க மாகக் குணம்பயில் வாரில்லை
வேறங்க மாக விளைவுசெய் தப்புறம்
பேறங்க மாகப் பெருக்குகின் றாரே. (௫)

5. None praise Him, the author of the Vedas with six *Angas*, by the names of His parts and attributes, (as set forth therein, such as *Nilakandam*, *Umasahayam*, *Virupaksham*, *Hiranyakesam* &c.), but they multiply the praises of the God with severable parts and hope to become one with those parts.

பாட்டு மொலியும் பறக்குங் கணிகையா
ராட்ட மறாத வவனியின் மாட்டாத
வேட்டு விருப்பார் விரதமில் லாதவ
ரீட்டு மிடஞ்சென் றிகலலுற் றாரே. (௬)

6. The hypocritical Brahmins who have not lost their desire, go and recite the Vedas in unholy and public places resounding with the song and dance of immoral women.

### IN PRAISE OF THE AGAMAS.

அஞ்சன மேனி யரிவையோர் பாகத்த
னஞ்சொ டிருபத்து மூன்றுள வாகம
மஞ்சலி கூப்பி யறுபத் தறுவரு
மஞ்சா முகத்தி லரும்பொருள் கேட்டதே. (௧)

1. The emerald-hued Uma's Lord gave out the the 28 Saiva Agamas, from His fifth Face, on the supplication with raised hands of the 60 Lords of Pranava.

அண்ண லருளா லருளுஞ் சிவாகம
மெண்ணி லிருபத்தெண் கோடிநூ றாயிரம்
விண்ணவ ரீசன் விழுப்ப முரைத்தனர்
நண்ணிநின் றப்பொரு ளேத்துவ னானே. (௨)

1. The five faces of Lord Sadasiva are called *Isanam*, *Tatpurusham*, *Ahoram*, *Vamadevam*, and *Satyôjatham*. The four Vedas came out from the lower four Heads, and the Agamas came out from the other raised Head called *Isanam*. The twenty-eight Agamas are Kamikam, Yogajam, Chinthiam, Karanam, Achitam, Teeptam, Sukshuma, Sagaschiram, Anjuman, Suprabetham, Vijayam, Vichchuvasam, Swayambuvam, Akelliniyam, Viram, Rowram, Makadam, Vimalam, Chandarajnanam Mahavimbam, Qurorkîtham, Lalitham, Chittam, Santhanam, Sarvoktham, Parameshvaram, Kiranam, Vathulam. Most of these are merely names and the originals are lost for ever. Even of the few that exist the Karma Kanda alone has been preserved. Sivagnanabotham is said to form part of Rowra Agama. There are Upagamas like Mirgendra, Paushkara, Siva Dharmottara, &c. which correspond to the Upanishads and they fully state the Saiva Philosophy. Unfortunately none of these works are yet in English. Care should be taken to distinguish these Agamas from the books of the Northern Left-hand School, which are clearly very late productions fully tinged with the Mayavada Doctrines. As the Saiva Agamas are dead against the idealism of Sankara, it is intelligible why he made so little use of them and tried to ignore them and throw dirt over it too.

2. The number of verses found in the Saiva Agamas graciously given out by our Lord, is 28 crores and one lac. The Devas praised the greatness of Isa, (from the study of the Agamas). I also praise the same Being, proclaimed in the Agamas.

பண்டித ராவார் பதினெட்டுப் பாடையுங்
கண்டவர் கூறுங் கருத்தறி வாரென்க
பண்டிதர் தங்கள் பதினெட்டுப் பாடையு
மண்ட முதலா வரன்சொன்ன வாறே. (௩)

3. Real Pandits are those who understood the meaning of the author of the 18 languages. And it is for their benefit and for the whole world, Lord Hara made these 18 languages.

அண்ண லருளா லருளுந் திவ்யாகமம்
விண்ணி லமரர் தமக்கும் விளங்கரி
தெண்ணி லெழுபது கோடிநூ றாயிர
மெண்ணிலு நீர்மே லெழுத்தது வாகுமே. (௪)

4. The beautiful Agamas given out graciously by our Lord is difficult to be understood by the Devas. Their number is countless. Unless understood properly, they are like figures in water (of no use).

பரனாய்ப் பராபரங் காட்டி யுலகிற்
றரனாய்ச் சிவதன்மந் தானேசொல் காலத்
தரனா யமரர்க ளர்ச்சிக்கு நந்தி
யுரனாகி யாகம மோங்குநின் றானே. (௫)

5. He was the Supreme Guru (under the Banyan tree), when He showed His Supreme Nature, He became Hara (Sadasiva) when going out to the world the Agamas containing Siva Dharma. He, my Nandi is worshipped by the Devas and stood firm on the crown of the Agama teaching.

சிவமாம் பரத்தினிற் சத்திசதாசிவ
முவமா மகேச ருருத்திர தேவர்
தவமால் பிரமீசர் தம்மிற்றாம் பெற்ற
நவவாகம மெங்க ணந்திபெற் றானே. (௬)

3. The following verse sets forth what the 17 languages are excepting Tamil.

“சிங்களம், சோனகம், சாவகம், சீனம், துளுக்குடகம், கொங்கணம், கன்னடம், கொலலம், தெலுங்கம், கலிங்கம், வங்கம், கங்கம், மகதம, கடாரம், கவுடம், கடுங்குசலம், தங்கும் புகழ்த்தமிழ்சூழ் பதினேழ்புவிதாமிவையே.”

So according to Tirumular Tamil or Sanscrit is not the only language by which God manifests his truth to mankind.

6. My Guru Nandi, got the nine Agamas which *Sakti* got from Sivam, Natham from Sakti, Vinthu from Natham, Sadasiva from Vinthu, Maheshwara from Sadasiva, Rudra from Maheshwara, Vishnu from Rudra, and Brahma from Vishnu in succession.

பெற்றநல் லாகமங் காரணங் காமிக
முற்றநல் வீர முயர்வா துளஞ்சிந்திய
மற்றவ் வியாமள மாகுங்கா லோத்திரந்
துற்றநற் சுப்பிரஞ் சொல்லு மகுடமே. (௭)

7. Such Agamas are *Karanam, Kamikam, Viram, Vathulam, Chinthiam, Vyamalam, Kalôttaram, Suppirabetham* and *Makutam*.

அண்ண லருளா லருளுஞ் சிவாகம
மெண்ணிலி கோடி தொகுத்திடு மாயி
னண்ண லறைந்த வறிவறி யாவிடி
னெண்ணிலி கோடியு நீர்மே லெழுத்தே. (௮)

8. The Agamas so graciously given out by our Lord contain countless verses. If the true meaning of them is not understood, the reading of them will be perfectly useless.

மாரியுங் கோடையும் வார்பனி தூங்கநின்
றேரியு நின்றங் கிளைக்கின்ற காலத்து
வாரிய முந்தமி ழும்முடனே சொல்லிக்
காரிகை யார்க்குங் கருணைசெய் தானே. (௯)

9. When during the summer and in winter, the dew does not cease, and the tanks are dry, in such a sore time, our Lord imparted the knowledge of Tamil and Sanscrit to His beloved spouse out of Grace.

அவிழ்க்கின்ற வாறு மதுகிட்டு மாறுஞ்
சிமிட்டலைப் பட்டுயிர் போகின்ற வாறுந்
தமிழ்ச்சொல் வடசொ லெனுமிவ் விரண்டு
முணர்த்து மவனை யுணரலு மாமே. (௧௦)

10. These two languages teach the way of Salvation, (of the wise) and of the enjoyment after release, and of death and birth (of the ignorant) and let us know therefore the Lord proclaimed by these two languages.

9. The season of utter desolation is graphically described. We are in the midst of such even now. Yet God's Grace is not lost altogether. The description here, however, applies to the time before creation and instances the antiquity of both these languages over all others. (After we wrote this, we had copious showers).

## THAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 12*).

உன்னிலையு மென்னிலையு மொருநிலை யெனக்கிடந்
 துளறிடு மவத்தையாகி
உருவுதான் காட்டாத வாணவமு மொளிகண்
 டொளிக்கின்ற விருளென்னவே
தன்னிலைமை காட்டா தொருங்கவிரு வினையினற்
 ருவுசுக துக்கவேலை
தட்டழிய முற்றுமில் லாமாயை யதனுற்
 றடித்தகில பேதமான
முன்னிலை யொழிந்திட வகண்டிதா காரமாய்
 மூதறிவு மேலுதிப்ப
முன்பினொடு கீழ்மே னடுப்பக்க மென்னுமன்
 முற்றுமா னந்தநிறைவே
என்னிலைமை யாய்நிற்க வியல்புகூ ரருள்வடிவ
 மெந்நாளும் வாழிவாழி
இகபர மிண்டினிலு முயிரினுக் குயிராகி
 யெங்குநிறை கின்றபொருளே. (கக)

99. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the soul of souls, both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions! Much glory and praise be to Thy Beneficial Manifestation* on my account.

Most delightful were its immediate results : The deleterious *anava,* which had tempted me unperceived into the unholiness of babbling that *Thy Subjective Nature* and my *objective nature* were one and the same and not *different,*† was by Thy blessed light, subdued to a state of nullity,‡ like darkness before light; the changing *samsara*§ with its ebb and flow of rebirths dwindled away at once ; the phenomenal appearance of the *'magic maya'* ceased ; and, above all, I was given the gnana of bliss that led me into the Infinite State of Supreme Ananda where there would be for me (soul) neither before nor behind, nor above nor below nor within nor without nor sides.

* The reference is to the Saint's initiation by Siva through Mauni.

† *c.f.* with notes verses 50, 83, 89, 91, 92, 95 and 98.

‡ Anava (ignorance) mala—the origin of samsâra--never ceases to exist even in the soul's moksha state. It only loses its power for ever like the heated seed or the suppressed senses of a yogin or Jivan Mukta. *c.f.* Saint's couplet. பாசமகலாமற் பதியிற் கலவா மன்—மாசில் சமத்து முத்தி வாய்க்கு நாளெந்நாளோ". (O for the day to be one with the Lord yet not the Lord, nor the pasa to discard ! *c. f.* 87th verse.

§ Samsara=cycle of existence full of transcient pleasure and pain.

### GOD-HEAD AS SAT-CHITHA-NANDA*SIVA.

### சச்சிதாநந்த சிவம்.

பாராதி ககனப் பரப்புமுண் டோவென்று
 படர்வெளிய தாகியெழுநாப்
பரிதிமதி காணுச் சுயஞ்சோதியாயண்ட
 பகிரண்ட வுயிரெவைக்கும்
நேராக வறிவா யகண்டமா யேகமாய்
 நித்தமாய் நிர்த்தொந்தமாய்
நிர்க்குண விலாசமாய் வாக்குமன மணுகாத
 நிர்மலா னந்தமயமாய்ப்
பேராது நிற்றிநீ சும்மா விருந்துதான்
 பேரின்ப மெய்திடாமல்
பேய்மனதை யண்டியே தாயிலாப் பிள்ளைபோல்
 பித்தாக வோமனதைநான்
சாராத படியறிவி னிருவிகற்பாங்கமாஞ்
 சாசுவத நிஷ்டையருளாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
 சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (ா)

100. O *Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all ! Thou art the omnipresent and all pervading Gnâna-Akas wherein the bhûta-âkas† with all its myriads of differentiations *earth* &c., occupies a very insignificant position ; Thou art the self-luminous Heavenly Brightness outshining and transcending the fire of seven tongues,‡ the Sun and the Moon. And Thou art the Super-eminent unique Wisdom of Infinite nature and bliss evidencing Thyself in the universality of *life.* And yet Thou art the Eternal Unconditioned *one* non-dual in character and void of properties and beyond all thought and speech.

Notwithstanding Thy Supernal existence as aforesaid, I have knit myself to the infernal mind and degraded myself to the position of a helpless orphan without taking to sacred quietism § of bliss.

* *C. F.* 1st verse (last portion of translation.) This word is the compound of *Sat* (real-existence or being) + *Chit* (Intelligence or knowledge or gnana) + *Ananda* (bliss or delight or joy or supreme pleasure of eternal unchangeable nature.)

† It means in brief that Siva-Lord is eternally everywhere like the akas or elemental ether and is not the latter ; and He is Gnana or Chaitanyam by nature and Pure Love and imparts highest delight or Ananda to His Matured devotees. *c. f.* Sri Kanta Bashya on the Vedanta Sutras I. i. 23 & 24. *c. f.* Tait. Upanishad 2-1. "From Atman ('Paramakasa') is akasa born."

‡ *C. F.* 36th verse (translation) and notes thereunder to '7 flames. *C. F.* Mund. Upanishad Section II part I-8. "Seven life-power come from Him, seven flames, seven foods (to feed the flames)."

§ Here the reference may be to the school of Quietists "who flourished at the close of the 17th century and who taught that the soul, *in the pursuit of the Supreme Good* must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in silence, be absorbed in *contemplation of the Deity.*"

Do Thou grant me now the unchangeable state of solemnity in which I shall remain for ever self-controlled in Thy contemplation without subjecting myself to the implacable mind.

குடக்கொடு குணக்காதி திக்கினை யுழக்கூடு
    கொள்ளல்போ லைந்துபூதம்
கூடுஞ் சுருங்கிலைச் சாலேகமொன்பது
    குலாவுநடை மனையைநாறும்
வடக்கயிறு வெண்ணரம் பாவென்பு தசையினால்
    மதவேள் விழாநடத்தி
வைக்கின்ற கைத்தேரை வெண்ணீர்செ நீர்கணீர்
    மலநீர்பு ணீரிறைக்கும்
விடக்குத் துருத்தியைக் கருமருந் துக்கூட்டை.
    வெட்டவெட் டத்தளிர்க்கும்
வேட்கைமர முறுகின்ற சுடுகாட்டை முடிவிலே
    மெய்போ லிருந்து பொய்யாம்
சடக்கைச் சடக்கெனச் சதமென்று சின்மயந்
    தானாகி நிற்பதென்றோ
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
    சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (௱க)

101. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! O for the day on which I shall realize my blessed Gnâna-Svarûpa * eternally raised above all conditions of time, after gaining knowledge of *this* my *infirm self* of seeming reality. This self which is the *temporary* erection composed of the five elements just like the quarters east, west &c. contained in a dry-measure.

This self which is the front-hall possessing nine clear * windows. This self which is the play-car handled in festival by *Manmatha* † and conducted by means of its white sinews, bones and flesh.

This self which is the fleshy bellows ejecting impure liquids red and white from the eyes, proud-flesh, and secretions. This self which is the nest-egg of the drug of re-incarnation. This *cremation ground* with the trees of 'desire, ‡ thereon which send forth their shoots as often as they are chopped.

பாகத்தி னாற்கவிதை பாடிப் படிக்கவோ
    பத்திநெறி யில்லைவேத
பாராய ணப்பனுவன் மூவர்செய் பனுவலது
    பகரவோ விசையுமில்லை
யோகத்தி லேசிறிது முயலவென் றாற்றேக
    மொவ்வாதி யூண்வெறுத்தால்
உயிர்வெறுத் திடலொக்கு மல்லாது கிரியைக
    ளுபாயத்தி னாற்செய்யவோ
மோகத்தி லேசிறிது மொழியவிலை மெய்ஞ்ஞான
    மோனத்தி னிற்கவென்றால்
முற்றாது பரிபாக சத்திக ளனேகநின்
    மூதறிவி லேயெழுந்த
தாகத்தி லேவாய்க்கு மமிர்தப்ர வாகமே
    தன்னந் தனிப்பெருமையே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
    சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே (௱உ)

102. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Any attempt on my part to sing in metrical verses Thy Supreme Power

---

* *Gnana Svarupa of the soul.*—Just as a man carrying a heavy load has to subject and adjust himself to various hardships and pains incidental to his carrying of it, so the human soul, whose nature is chit or intelligence and which is bearing this self (*i. e.* this personality or physical body), *for the purpose of its spiritualization,* has to undergo various difficulties incidentally arising from the body's material tendencies—to wit—Kama, desire &c., (the effects of flesh and blood and bones and sinews the product of the 5 elements). Here it may be asked, If Lord-Siva hath given us this body as a vehicle for us to travel in through the path of spiritualization, why should the Supreme choose such a bad vehicle for us? This query finds a ready infallible answer from a Siddhanti, who does not say like the Idealists &c., that this body (*i. e.* the matter or the five elements) is a non-entity; or that it is a projection from the Parabrhaman's own substance or existence or self; or that it was brought to existence from nothing or non-existence. What the Siddhanti says is, in the words of the Saint, "அருளுடைய பரமென்றோ அன்றுதானே யானுளனென்றும், எனக்கே யாணவாதி பெருகுவினைக்கட்டு (Whenever there was the Supreme Being of Arul Sakti, I (the soul) have been since then co-existent with Him; and inseparable with me and for me hath been the bondage of action (Karma Mala) caused by my *anava* mala the antecedent cause of this *Maya* mala (*i. e.* this matter, my body). Thus matter (maya mala) being co-existent with souls as well as God and the souls with it being ever co-existent with and dependent on God, the query as to its (matter's) origin becomes illogical and unwarranted. It is our daily experience we see that dirt will remove the dirt of copper when rubbed together *by an agent*; but if allowed to gather, it enshrouds the natural brightness of the copper. So, we (souls) require an author (rubber) the Supreme Siva, who, out of pure Benevolence, effects by His Arul Sakti our bodies out of *Maya* (matter) by the process of differentiation. For *Maya* or matter cannot differentiate itself nor do the Souls by their nature possess the power or capacity to bring about the differentiation of *Maya* towards their evolution. Hence the God is appropriately called Siva *i. e.,* God of Love or Benevolence. *c. f.,* verses 97 and 98 with notes and also 72nd verse.

* The 9 windows are:—2 eyes, 2 ears, 2 nostrils, the mouth, and the 2 lowest orifices. To these some Sages add the navel and the opening at the top of the skull.

† Manmatha is the Hindu name of the God of Love.

‡ This description of our body shews the *Saint's* view which lends to support to the truth of the analogy of the 'carrier' stated above.

This *Maya,* matter, true and false:
True, when to Lord it serves a tool,
To save the souls; and call it false,
When doth its *magic* th' souls befool.

and Benevolence might fall short of bhakti * or love of devotion to Thee. Or any attempt towards the recitation of the Tamil Veda Tiruvachakam † or the mystic poems of the three Sivite Saints ‡ might fall short of the harmonious flow of tone peculiar to them. Any effort towards the *Yoga* practice might hardly suit my bodily constitution. Any abstinence on my part from food-taking might deprive me of this life. To devise any means for doing the pious acts of *pûja* &c., I am not at all rid of lust. And should I endeavour to habituate myself to the taciturn state of *mona, the verge and mark of the Supreme Sivagnana,* § my mind is ruffled in hundreds of ways by the wonderful powers of *Asutta maya.* ||

*Thou* must only guide me, O The Absolute Lord of Greatness! O The Bounty of nectar flowing in full to the aspirants of Siva-Sayujya, ¶ the thirst for which arises in them from *Thy knowledge Supreme* the final Siva-gnâna !*

இமையளவு போதையொரு கற்பகா லம்பண்ணு
    மிவ்வுலக மெவ்வுலகமோ
என்றெண்ணம் வருவிக்கு மாதர்சிற் றின்பமோ
    வென்னின்மக மேருவாக்கிச்
சுமையெடுமி னென்றுதான் சும்மாடு மாயெமைச்
    சுமையாளு மாக்கிநாளும்
துர்ப்புத்தி பண்ணியுள நற்புத்தி யாவையுஞ்
    சூறையிட் டிந்த்ரஜாலம்
அமையவொரு கூத்துஞ் சமைந்தாடு மனமாயை
    யம்மம்ம வெல்லவெளிதோ
அருள்பெற்ற பேர்க்கெலா மொளிபெற்று நிற்குமீ
    தருளோவ லாதுமருளோ
சமயநெறி காணாத சாக்ஷிநீ சூக்ஷமமாத்
    தமியனேற் குளவுபுகலாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
    சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (௱௩)

103. *O Satchithánandha Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Ah! How can I conquer this deceitful mind of *maya*? It causes a momentary winking to appear as long as a great cosmic period of *Kalpa.*† It gets me to imagine this earth to be some other phenomenal region. It makes a *Maha Meru* ‡ of the sexual love and not only causes me to bear *that* burden serving itself as a pad for my head, but also constrains me to a vicious condition of life stripping off all my good qualities. In short, it leaps and frisks about and plays a wonderful juggle.

Yet, however, O Lord, in those blessed muktas of Thine, it becomes as bright § as Thy Grace.

Do Thou make me understand, O Seer of all, transcending all religious thoughts, whether *such* a mind in its nature is the Divine Light of Thy Grace or the unholy *darkness* of ignorance. ||

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

*(To be continued).*

* Any act of piety without bhakti or real love to God is like the flower without fragrance and will not be appreciated by Him. *c.f.* Tiruvachakam "பத்திவலையிற் படுவோன் காண்க." (Behold! He (Siva-Lord) can be caught only by a net of *bhakti.*)

† The Sivite Saint Shrimat Manickavachakar was a brahmin prime-minister of the King Pandya of Madura and was initiated by the Supreme Siva-Lord in Tiruperundurai appearing as Guru with the Sacred Book 'Sivagnana Botham' in His hands and thenceforward sang Thiruvachakam and worked good many miracles such as making a dumb princess of an opponent sing in tamil the glory of Siva-Lord &c. (*Vide* also Dr. G. U. Pope's translation of 'Thiruvachakam for full details).

‡ The 3 Sivite Saints are Shrimat Apparswami (a Saiva Vellala), Shrimat Gnanasambandar (who lived as a brahmin) and Shrimat Sundarar (brahmin). These three and the *said* Manickavachakar are called together 'நால்வர்' or சைவசமயாசாரிகள் (The four or the establishers of the Saiva Samayam, the Saiva Philosophy *i. e.* the (Saiva) Siddhanta. They revealed this system as the Supreme Truth. So these four holy Saints are represented by the four idols in every I'swara's Temple in India. For fuller details about these four and the rest of the Sivite Saints, all 63 in number, the sacred book 'Periapurana' may be referred to.

§ *c.f.* the great Divine Poetess 'Avvai' "மோனமென்பது ஞான வரம்பு" (what can be called '*mona*' is the verge and mark (வரம்பு) of the true Gnana).

|| *Asutta maya*—avidya maya *i. e.* maya causing ignorance in souls by its deceitful tendencies which are multifarious (*c. f.* verse 101 and notes). This *maya* or *jada-maya* sakti is matter. It is mistaken for the Supreme Parâ Sakti (female Principle) of the Supreme Siva. It is this Female Principle that is represented as Maha Vishnu (not the Trinity Vishnu) or Parvati or Kali. This is the reason why the bigoted Vishnuvites adore and worship 'Parvati' (Goddess) only in Siva-Temples, thus making a *fanatic* distinction between Siva and His Sakti.

¶ *Siva-Sayujya* is the Highest state of Moksha. It literally means "intimate union with Siva in His Absolute Nature as Love." *c. f.* notes under 41st verse.

* Compare the 36th verse (translation), and its notes.

† Kalpa is the great cosmic period—a day of Bramha equal to 1000 yugas.

‡ Maha meru is the greatest of mountains used here to represent the hyperbolical character of the mind.

§ It is one of the sound postulates of this school that, of the 3 malas, the anava (the cause of the other two and the offshoot of the mind) of the muktas becomes one with the splendour attained by them (muktas) and sub-servient to their wishes.

|| Ignorance is the *avava mala.*

THE

# LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

# Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, SEPTEMBER 1898.

## THE ANALOGIES IN GITA.

Analogy is very largely used in the elucidation and explanation of various principles in Oriental philosophy, and with more or less effect. In most cases they serve a very important function, and many truths there are, which by reason of their dealing with the ultimate existences can alone be demonstrated by such analogies and not by any other kind of proof. In the use of such analogies there are great dangers also and the analogy may look so plausible that one is apt to be carried away by it, without noting the inherent flaw in it and which a little closer investigation will clearly bring out. Care should, however, be taken to distinguish between analogies which are merely similes or metaphors, based on a mere semblance, and intended merely to bring home to our minds, the subject matter in a more impressive and clearer light, and analogies strictly so-called, intended as proof. In the latter case, mere semblance alone will not do, and there must be sameness in the various parts of the illustration and the thing illustrated. Neglect of this rule often leads to great confusion and error in thought. If for the particular inference desired, the antecedents conform to the antecedents in the analogy, the inference will be quite justified if it conforms to the consequence in the analogy; and it would be simply illogical to strain the illustration to other purposes and to extremes. Analogy at best is but an indifferent kind of proof and where we do not take the proper precautions in using it, its value in philosophic argument will be almost nothing. Another source of error in the use of analogies by Indian writers is the brevity of expressions which is characteristic of such analogies as we meet them in some of the most ancient books. Where the analogy is taken literally without supplying the necessary parts and ellipses, they cannot but lead one astray.

There is one school of philosophers in India, who are inordinately fond of these similes and who at almost every step seek the aid of a simile to help them out of their position; and these similes have now only become too much hackneyed and they pass from mouth to mouth, and even educated persons repeat them parrot-like, who would easily find out the fallacy, if the matter is only put before them for a moment. We expected at least those learned in the lore of the West to explain their subject instead of building all their argument on the strength of these doubtful similes and in this respect, even European scholars are not without reproach. For what shall we say of a scholar like Dr. Paul Deussen, if he gives expression to the following false analogy? Says he, "And then for him, when death comes, no more *Samsara*. He enters into Brahman, like streams into the ocean: he leaves behind him *nama* and *rupam*, he leaves behind him *individuality*; but he does not leave behind him his Atman, his Self. It is not the falling of the drop into the infinite ocean, it is the whole ocean, becoming free from the fetters of ice, returning from its frozen state to that what it is really and has never ceased to be, to its own all pervading, eternal, almighty nature." In these few lines he crowds together as many fallacies as there are words in it, and we have neither the time nor patience to indicate all of them. We will however point out the most glaring of them. The Soul returning from its migrations to its resting place, its final goal was the stream returning to the bosom of the mighty ocean. When the stream joins the ocean, it loses its name and form? Does it really do so, and if it did what of that, how is it in any way changed? What we generally call a stream is a small body of water flowing between two banks. The water by itself without its local connection cannot be called the stream. The moment the water leaves its local connection, it ceases to be called stream. So it is not really the stream that flows into the ocean but that the water of the stream flowed into and mixed with the water of the ocean. What makes really the difference between the ocean and the stream is the difference in the largeness and smallness of the respective bodies and the largeness and smallness of the receptacle. The water in either receptacle is acted

on by the sun and wind, is tempest-tossed and discoloured and made muddy. The juggle by which the learned Doctor converts the stream water, nay a drop, into a mighty *ocean* is not manifest in the illustration. The drop or the stream water is the drop or the stream water in the bosom of the ocean though, for the time being, we are unable to distinguish its *identity*. When the *identity* is lost, its *individuality* is not seen, is lost in a sense also. The water remains as water and has not lost its *nama* and *rupa*, though this water gets other names by other accidents. It is the accident that determines the more specific name and we will have to enquire how the thing acquired this accident or became parted from it. Then we come to the figure of the frozen ocean and the free ocean. Here is a jump from one figure to another. The bound soul was formerly the stream, and the freed soul the ocean. In either case, we observed above, the two bodies of water were subject to the same changeability and disabilities except that one was larger than the other. Now, the bound soul is the frozen ocean and the freed soul is the ocean after it had thawed. And the learned Doctor speaks of the fetters of ice. What does it matter to the ocean whether it was in a frozen condition or otherwise? How does it cease to be almighty, all-pervading and eternal when it is frozen than when it was not? One would think that if the ocean's wishes were to be consulted it would much better like to be frozen than not, as it would not be subjected to the mercy of the Wind, and the Sun and the Moon. Water is water whether it remains a liquid or a gas or a solid substance. And it would be mere rhetoric to ascribe fetters to it. And this fetter is real or fancied, either an evil or a good. If real and an evil, how did this fetter happen to be put on. If not, why try to get rid of the fetter. The fetter was put on by the ocean's own will or by another will more powerful still. If the ocean put it on by its own will, it may do so again, and there is no inducement for any body to try to get rid of this fetter, and "*the strongest support of pure morality, the greatest consolation in the sufferings of life and death,*" would surely be undermined. If by another's will, who is the greater than this A'tman; no doubt the Paramatman, which ends in veritable dualism. In the case of the ocean itself, it did not become frozen by its own will or power. As water, its nature is unstable and changeable, and the change is brought about by other causes. If we apply heat to it, its liquid condition disappears and it becomes a gas. Withdraw the heat, and the more you do it, the water becomes more solid, and in the arctic regions, where the sun, thousands of times more powerful than the ocean water, is altogether absent for several months the water gets affected by cold and darkness, and gets fettered in ice. The learned Doctor failed to take stock of the antecedent agent, in the frozening or otherwise of the ocean, namely the sun, and hence his error. The Siddhantis take the water whether it it be that of the ocean or that of the smallest rill as analogous to the Soul and the universal *Akas* present both in the water of the stream and that of the ocean as the Parames'hvara and Paramatman, the universal Supporter, and all-Pervader; and the Glorious Sun is also God, whose panchakritya is also felt on the ocean and stream water, in its making and increasing and dissolving, and under whose powerful S'akti the minor powers of Karma (wind and moon) also find play, and the whole cycle of evolution is set agoing.

And it is this learned Doctor who spoke of the *misinterpreting variations* of Sankara's *advaita*, known under the names of Visishtadvaita, Dvaita, &c, and it is the frequent boast of people of his ilk, that Sankara's Advaita is the most universal and ancient system, whereas all other forms of Indian philosophy are only partial and sectarian and modern; and in the present paper, we propose to deal with this claim, to a certain extent by taking up the Gita, their most beloved Upanishad, and by merely taking the various analogies used by Lord Krishna, we will show, whether we find among them or not any of the favourite and hackneyed similes of this school, and whether the similes actually have any bearing on the special tenets of this school.

The first simile in the book occurs in chapter 2, 13.

"Just as in this body, childhood, and youth and old age appertain to the embodied man, so also does it acquire another body."

This is a popular enough simile, and its meaning is plain but it cannot be construed as is done by Sankara, that the soul undergoes no change or is not affected by the change of avastas or change of bodies; for it cannot be contended that the intelligence of Sankara is in the same embryonic stage as that of a new born babe, and the denial of this would also militate against all our ideas of evolutionary progress and the necessity for undergoing many births. In the previ-

ous verse, Sri Krishna postulated the existence of many souls, by asserting, 'neither did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men, and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist; "and he reiterates the same fact, in chapter iv, 5, where he alludes to his own former births. which fact is also mentioned by Sri Krishna himself again in the Anucasana Parva and stated by Vyasa in the Yuddha Parva. By,'I' and 'thou', and 'these', he clearly does not refer to their bodies as Sankara interprets. The next figure occurs in verse 22 of the same chapter, "just as a man casts off worn-out clothes and puts on others which are new, so the soul casts off worn-out bodies and enters which are new." Similar instances are that of the serpent throwing off its skin, the mind passing from the conscious into the dream condition, and the Yogi into another body which are given by Saint Meikandan. The next one occurs in verse 58, where the Sage withdrawing his senses from the objects of sense is compared to the tortoise withdrawing its limbs, at the approach of anybody. The same simile occurs in Tiruvarutpayan.

In chapter 3, only one illustration occurs and this in verse 38, which we have often quoted. "As fire is covered with smoke, as a mirror with dirt, as an embryo is enclosed in a womb, so this is covered with it." Sankara explains, "as a bright fire is covered with a dark smoke *co-existent* with it......... so this is covered with desire."! The italics is ours. What 'this' and 'it' are, are seen to be, man and his wisdom-nature, Prakriti-guna Rajas and Desire constraining one to the commission of sins. 'Constrained,' Sankara explains as a servant by the King. Man is enslaved by his passion; his wisdom is such that it is deluded by unwisdom, ignorance (verse 40). Sankara leaves these passages quietly enough but when explaining the similar passage (xiv, 5) "Sattva, Rajas, Tamas,—these three Gunas, O mighty armed, born of Prakriti, *bind fast* in the body, the embodied, the indestructible," Sankara says, "now one may ask: It has been said that the embodied is not tainted (xiii, 31). How then, on the contrary, is it said here that the (Gunas) bind him? We have met this objection by adding '*as it were*'; thus 'they bind him as it were.'" It would have been well for his reputation, if he had not raised the objection himself and tried to meet it in the way he has done. Why did not the Omniscient Lord Krishna himself add this 'as it were,' and leave these passages alone apparently contradicting each other. In his explanation, he has omitted the force of '*fast*,' and he has forgotten '*Dragged and constrained*' and of the *co-existent darkness and delusion of the former passage and explanation*. There is one other passage relating to the soul and its bound condition namely verse 21 in chapter xiii itself. "Purusha, as seated in Prakriti, *experiences the qualities born of Prakriti*; "*attachment* to qualities is the cause of his birth in good and evil wombs." Lo, the Supreme Self, attaching itself to qualities born of Prakriti, constrained to commit sin deluded by co-existent darkness, having to undergo births and deaths and getting fettered and seeking salvation, and all this '*as it were*.'! What a precious excuse would it not prove, this '*as it were*,' to the murderer, the forger, the liar, the thief &c.? Besides, Sankara identifies the *embodied* of verse 5, xiv, with the 'dweller in the body' in xiii, 31. Even so far as forms of expression go, they are not altogether the same thing. It may be noted that the expression 'embodied' is always used in describing the soul, Jîva, and never to denote God. Though God is seated in the hearts of all, he is the Soul of Souls, and Light of Lights, He can never be called the '*embodied*.' The expression '*embodied*' conveys itself the idea of attachment and bondage. Anybody reading verses 36 to 40 of chapter 3, and xiii, 21; xiv, 5, 20; and, verses iv, 14; ix, 9; xiii, 31 together, can fail to observe the utter contrast of the two entities; and we appeal to common sense if Sankara's '*as it were*' will do away with this distinction and contrast. The distinction and contrast is brought out in different chapters, in the same chapter and in contiguous verses (xv, 16, 17, 18) nay in the same verse (v. 15). The word '*another*' '*Anyatha*' is itself a technical word, as 'the inside of' '*Antas*' &c., and occurs in the Gita in other places and in a number of Vedic texts to denote God Supreme as distinguished from the souls and the world, the entities admitted by Kapila Sankhyas Adhikaranas 4 to 9 of the Vedanta Sutra, and the texts quoted therein which appear in this very issue fully bear out our thesis. The apparent confusion caused by both the human spirit and the Supreme Spirit being spoken of as dwelling in the human body is altogether removed by the Mantras which speak of 'the two birds entering into the cave,' 'Rudra, destroyer of pain enters into me,' 'He who abides in the *Vijñāna*,' 'He who abides in the *Atman*,' 'higher than the high, higher than the imperishable,' (*c. f.* xv, 18, Gita). Leaving this subject for the present

we proceed. Chapter iv contains also only one simile, (37); "As kindled fire reduces fuel to ashes, O Arjuna; so does the wisdom fire reduce all Karma to ashes." The next illustration occurs in chapter v. 16, and is a very familiar one, that of Sun and darkness. "But in those in whom *unwisdom* is destroyed by the Wisdom of the Self, like the Sun the wisdom illuminates That Supreme." We have to read the previous passage together. "The Lord takes neither the evil nor the good deed of any; wisdom is enveloped by unwisdom; thereby mortals are deluded."

Here 'wisdom' clearly means atma, atmagnan, Soul, Soul's intelligence. This intelligence is covered by Agnana, unwisdom. As contrasted with ignorance-covered soul, there stands the Parameshwara, untouched by evil, though dwelling in the body. How is the Soul's wisdom to get rid of the veil of unwisdom. If it was able to get rid of this wisdom by its own wisdom, it could have got rid of it the moment it wills so, and we will never hear of a soul in bondage. So the illustration explains how this is done. Unwisdom is destroyed not by the soul's wisdom (spoken of merely as wisdom) but by Atmagnan, Brahmagnan Sivagnana, leading to the perception and enjoyment of Sivananda, as the darkness covering the individual eye, flees before the Rising Glory of the Effulgent Sun, and the Sun while it dispels the darkness, at the same time enables the eye to exercise its own power of seeing (soul's wisdom) and makes it see the Sun itself. The reader is requested to read the simile as explained, with Sankara's own explanation and form his own conclusions.

"As a lamp in a sheltered spot does not flicker" is the simile of the Yogi in Divine Union. 'திரையற்ற நீர்போல் சிந்தை தெளிவார்." "Like the waveless sea-water, the gnani attains clearness and calm" is another simile. The water and the lamp are by nature changeable, any little gust of wind (karmamala) can make the one flicker and the other form into ripples. But the Sun, or Akasha (God) can n either flicker nor change. And this is exactly the simile in ix. 6. The simile in vii. 7 demands however our prior attention. There is naught higher than I, O Dhananjaya, in me, all this is woven as a row of gems on a string. Here the string is the Ishwara, and gems, other creatures and objects. Neither can the string become the gems, nor the gems the string; it only brings out the distinction of the lower and the higher Padarthas spoken of in verse 5, and how Ishwara supports and upholds the whole universe, as a string does support the various gems.

The next simile already alluded to is in chapter ix, 6. "As the mighty wind moving everywhere rests in the Akasha, know thou that so do all beings rest in me." And Lord Krishna states the truth explained by this as the Kingly science, the Kingly secret, immediately comprehensible; and well may he say so, as this explains the true nature of advaita. The verses 4 and 5, have to be stated in full. "By me all this world is pervaded, my form unmanifested. All beings dwell in Me; and I do not dwell in them." "Nor do beings dwell in me, behold my Divine Yoga! Bearing the beings and not dwelling in them is my Self the cause of beings." With this we might read also the similes in xiii. 32, and 33 "As the all-pervading Akasha is by reason of its subtlety never soiled, so God seated in the body is not soiled." "As the one Sun illumines all these worlds, so does the Kshetri (not Kshetrajña) illumine all Kshetra," and the simile in xv. 8. "When the Lord (the jîva the lord of the aggregate of the body and the rest—Sankara) acquires a body and when he leaves it, he takes these and goes as the wind takes scents from their seats." Here Parames'hwara is compared to Akasha and the soul, jîva is compared to the wind; and the relation between God and Soul is the same relation as between Akasha and wind or things contained in Akasha. And what is this relation? Logicians and Siddhantis call this relation as Vyapaka Vyapti Sambandam, container and contained. We explained in our article on 'Mind and Body' that this was not a very apt relation as it has reference to quantity, yet it is the best synonym and illustration of the *Advaita* relation not Betha, (Madhwa) nor Abetha or nor Bethabetha (Ramanuja) not Parinama (Vallabha), not Vivarta (Sankara), but Vyapaka Vyapti relation. Taking the five elements, and the order of their evolution and involution it is seen, how all the four evolve from and resolve into Akasha. But earth is not water, nor water earth, water is not fire, nor fire water, fire is not air, nor air fire, none of these is Akasha nor Akasha any of these. And yet all solids can be reduced to liquids, and liquids into gaseous condition and all disappear into Akasha. The one lower is contained in the one higher, and all in Akasha but Akasha cannot be said to be *contained* in any of these, though present in each. Each one is more subtle and more vast than the lower element,

and Akasha is the most subtle and vastest and most pervasive and invisible ('my form unmanifested'). Akasha is not capable of any change, though the wind and water and fire and earth contained in it can be contaminated by that to which it becomes attached. Wind carries off scents, and is subjected to all the forces of sun and moon. Water of the ocean becomes saltish, becomes frozen, and becomes tempest-tossed. The lamp flickers and becomes smoky or bright, spreads a fragrant smell or otherwise by the nature of the oil or wood it is burning. The very illustration of sea (space,) water and winds is used by Saint Meikandan in vii, 3-3 to illustrate ignorance not attaching itself to God but to the Soul. "Ignorance will not arise from God who is the True Intelligence, as it is Asat (like darkness before sun). The soul which is ever united to God is co-eternal with Him. The connection of ignorance with the soul is like the connection of salt with the water of the sea." The word '*Akasha*' by the way is a technical word, like 'another,' 'antas,' 'jyotis' &c. and is a synonym for God (*vide* Vedanta Sutras I, 1-22 and texts quoted thereunder and in the article 'House of God, 'Chit Ambara' in p. 153 last volume).

The simile of streams and the sea occurs in xi, 28, to illustrate not the entering into moksha, but undergoing dissolution and death. The similes in xv, 1 & 2, the Ashwattha rooted above and spreading below, and in xviii, 61, that "the Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings (jivas) O Arjuna, whirling by Maya all beings (as if) mounted on a machine;" are the very last to be noted. These are nearly all the similes discovered in the Gita, and do we not miss here nearly all the favourite similes of the Mayavada school, and if so, how was it the omniscient Lord Krishna failed to use any one of them?

---

## EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

### The Divine Perfections.

(*Continued from page* 66.)

God Eternal.

Since God is the First Cause and the only source of all possible being, He must exist of absolute necessity and therefore can have no beginning or end. Eternity properly belongs to God alone, and it is identified with his essence. As He is now, so He has always been in the past, and will be always in the future. Coexisting with all assignable moments of time the eternal God is above any of our measures of the contingent duration of created things. In Him therefore there is neither present nor past nor future. Thou O Lord art the Everlasting God who hast created the ends of the earth. Ps. 40. 28. Before the mountains were made, or the earth and the world was formed: from eternity and to eternity thou art God. Ps. 89. 2. Thy years are unto generation and generation. Ps. 101. 25. In the beginning O Lord thou foundest the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish but Thou remainest; and all of them shall grow old like a garment and as a vesture thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed: But thou art always the self same and thy years shall not fail. Ps. 101. 26.

God immutable.

Indeed God is always the self-same, namely, unchanging, and this follows from his being an infinite and simple Being. As it has been proved above, God is infinitely perfect. But evidently, He could not be so, if he were liable to any change: for, by this He must either become more or less perfect and good. If we take the first alternative and suppose Him to be bettered by the change. He could not have been infinite in perfection before it. The other alternative is still more obviously untenable; if he becomes less perfect by the change, His infinity would evidently cease to be. The same conclusion may be drawn from the simplicity of God. By every change, a thing must either lose or acquire some quality or affection of its being. On the former supposition it must consist of at least two really distinct realities before it changes: otherwise it would lose nothing. On the latter, it is composed of at least two distinct realities after the change. In neither case can it be necessarily a simple Being. But as we have shown, God is necessarily simple to the exclusion of all real and even of all virtual composition. Consequently he must be absolutely unchangeable. Cfr. B. Boedder. S. Y. Natural Theology. p. 239.

God One.

We shall finally crown all the attributes of Almighty God, by asserting of Him, that He is One in essence, namely that the Divine nature exists undivided, that is, is not something belonging severally and distinctly to several beings. I may appeal first to the unity of the universe as testifying to the unity of its author. Science goes to show that the universe has been built on one plan. The universe itself is one system, namely each part is either dependent upon other parts, or is connected with some other parts by some physical law, as by motion, gravitation, affinity, elasticity and so forth. The universe is absolutely one, there is not one atom of matter independent of the thousand laws that govern the existence and the activity of this beautiful universe. When you look at the starry heavens, think not that those enormous globes situated so far off have no influence on our small earth. It may be as yet unknown, it may be as yet not recognized by science, but that they do exercise influence is shown by the general law of analogy. Make for instance the water of the sea less salty by half than it is at present and the whole world will be very near destruction. The waters will be very soon corrupted, the tide will fall short, the evaporation will be doubled, no gentle rain but a deluge will sweep away lands and fields, fishes will die in the sea, men will starve or else die of pestilence on land. There exists nothing, but that contributes either directly or indirectly to the existence, conservation or ornamentation of the universe. There is not a blade of grass in the meadow, a pebble in the river, a microzoa in the water, an atom of dead or living matter in the air, but has its why in creation, its laws, its many-fold links by which it is connected with each creature, and with the whole universe. But this unity of plan, this uniformity of design bespeaks unity of designer also, and proves beyond any reasonable doubt that the intelligent architect of this world, the infinitely-intelligent Maker of this Universe must be one in Essence, One in mind, one in will, that is one intelligent personal God. To this conclusion assents Mr. John Stuart Mill, a man not too easy of belief. He says: (Boedder Natural Theology, page 89.)

" The specific effect of science is to show by accumulating evidence that every event in nature is connected by laws with some fact or facts which preceded it or in other words depends for its existence on some antecedent, but yet not so strictly on one as not to be liable to frustration or modification from others: for these distinct chains of causation are so entangled with one another, the action of each cause is so interfered with by other causes, though each acts according to its own fixed law, that every effect is truly the result rather of the aggregate of all causes in existence, than of any one only, and nothing takes place in the world of our experience without spreading a perceptible influence of some sort through a greater or less portion of nature, and making perhaps every portion of it slightly different from what it would have been, if that event had not taken place. Now when once the double conviction has found entry into the mind that every event depends upon antecedents: and at the same time, that to bring it about many antecedents must concur, perhaps all the antecedents in nature, in so much that a slight difference in any of them might have prevented the phenomenon or materially altered its character—the conviction follows that no one event, certainly no one kind of events can be absolutely preordained or governed *by any Being but One*, who holds in his hand the reins of all Nature and not of some department only. At least if a plurality be supposed, it is necessary to assume so complete a concert of action and unity of will among them that the difference is for most purposes immaterial between such a theory and that of the absolute unity of the Godhead. The reason then why monotheism may be accepted as the representative of theism in the abstract, is not so much because it is the theism of all the more improved portions of the human race, as because it is the only theory which can claim for itself any footing on scientific ground." Science therefore is to show that Almighty God is the only ruler, the only architect, the only creator and Lord of Universe, and as such is one God only. Nor is the conclusion of reason different either-God is, as we have shown, the self existing Being and as such simple and immutable. If there are several self-existing Beings the reason of the distinction between them must either be self-existence as such, or something outside of it. The first alternative is absurd, contradictory and inconsistent with its terms: because should self-existence be the reason of the distinction between them. only one would be self-existent: all the rest, for the sake of distinction falling short of it. Nor is the second alternative less absurd: because as the self-existent Being is of necessity simple, there is nothing in Him but self-existence, and in consequence there is no ground for the distinction in question.

Two Infinite Beings impossible.

Moreover, God being infinite, the coexistence of two infinite Beings becomes at once absurd and impossible. For, if they are said to be two, there must be some difference between them, else they are not two but one. But no difference is possible between them except in so far as one lacks something which the other has. Now, if the former lacks something which the latter has, what will become of his infinity? How can he still be said to be infinite, whilst one corner at least of his being is limited or curtailed of one perfection, which the other has, and which is the ground of the distinction between the two? Therefore that there is one God alone is a truth that cannot be call-

ed in question and in face of the arguments above given, no one can possibly attempt to defend the worship which the heathens offer to their false Gods.

"There is not an object," says the learned scholar Monier Williams (Religious thoughts and life in India page 350) "in heaven or earth which a Hindu is not prepared to worship—sun, moon, and stars; rocks, stocks and stones; trees, shrubs and grass; sea, pools and rivers, his own implements of trade; the animals he finds most useful, the noxious reptiles he fears, men remarkable for any extraordinary qualities—, for great valour, sanctity, virtue or even vice; good and evil demons, ghosts and goblins, the spirits of departed ancestors; and infinite number of semihuman, and semidivine existences: inhabitants of the seven upper and the seven lower worlds—each and all come in for a share of divine honour or a tribute of more or less adoration."

I know that some educated Hindus deny that their countrymen are idolators. They say that idols are only like photographs, serving to remind us of those we love. This may be true when said of educated people, but it is quite false in regard to the mass of the common people. The pantheistic theory which more or less underlies all Hindu religious sects in this country induces the worshippers to view their idols in the light of God, or as real personifications of the divine attributes. So much is shown by a Hindu the gifted Ram Mohun Roy "Neither do they regard images of these gods merely in the light of instruments for elevating the mind to the conception of those supposed beings; they are simply in themselves made objects of worship. For whatever Hindu purchases an idol in the market, or constructs one with his own hands, or has one made under his own superintendence, it is his invariable practice to perform certain ceremonies, called Pran-Prathishtha, or the endowment of animation by which he believes that its nature is changed from that of the mere materials of which it is formed, and that it acquires not only life but supernatural powers. Shortly afterwards if the idol be of a masculine gender, he marries it to a feminine one: with no less pomp and magnificence than he celebrates the nuptials of his own children. The mysterious process is now complete; and the god and goddess are esteemed the arbiters of his destiny, and continually receive his most ardent adoration."

Catholics not Idolators.

There are some who try to excuse the worship that the Hindu people offer to idols by saying that if it is idolatory to pray to images, the Christian Catholics too are idolators. Now this plea is quite insufficient; for Catholics, *pray before images, not to images.* Catholics make use of images as of photographs serving to remind them of those they love; but they do not regard their statues or pictures in the light of gods or as real personifications of the divine attributes. Catholics do not believe that, by the blessing of the priest, their statues and pictures change their material nature into the nature of God, or of those superior Beings which the statues or pictures represent. Catholics do not believe that their statues and pictures have a supernatural life and supernatural powers, that they are possessed, inhabited, animated by the deity. If such were their belief they would be no less idolators than the great mass of the Hindu people. The veneration which Catholics pay to images is *not absolute, is relative*: it does not stop at the image, it is not referred to the image, but to the person which the picture represents, just as when we bow to the statue of Her Majesty the Queen Empress, we bow not to the statue but to the Queen of whom the statue is a senseless and material likeness. Moreover, in order that the homage paid to images may be defensible, the images must represent persons worthy of veneration. Now, are the gods and goddesses of the Hindu Pantheon worthy of a veneration? Are their lives and morals, as depicted in the Puranas, such as to deserve reverence and adoration? Let each Hindu answer to himself, and I am sure that his conclusion will not be far different from mine.

G. BARTOLI, S.J., D.D.

(*To be continued.*)

## KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page 70*).

Now and then Kamban expresses his ideas in the most impressive and striking manner. Dasaratha, instead of saying to Kaikeyi that "You will soon become a widow when your son is installed," is made to say "உன், கழுத்தின்ஞாணுன்மகற்குக் காப்பின்ஞாணென்றான்." Then, again, thinking of Rama, he soliloquizes thus:—"நின்மேற சொரிய, மண்ணும்நீராய் வந்த புனலை மகனே வினையேற், குண்ணும்நீராயுதவியுயர் கானடைவாயென்றான்" implying that he will certainly die. "நோக்கினால் சுமந்திரன்னுவலலுற்றதை, வாக்கினாலன்றியே உணர்ந்தமாதவன்" (4—ஆற்றுப்படலம் of Ayodhya kandam)—what Sumanthiran indicated by his look Vasishta understood without words.

மாலு மக்கணம் வாளியைத் தொட்டதும்
கோலவிற் கால் குனித்ததுங் கண்டிலர்
காலனைப் பறித்தக் கடியாள் விட்ட
சூல மற்றன துண்டங்கள் கண்டனர்.
(70-தாடகைவதை)

and again (கார்முகம் 35.)

தடுத்திமை யாம லிருந்தவர் தாளின்
மடுத்தது நாணுதி வைத்தது நோக்கார்
கடுப்பினின் யாரு மறிந்திலர் கையால்
எடுத்தது கண்டனரிற்றது கேட்டார்.

Note what வாலி says :—

" வாய்மையுமரபுங் காத்துமன்னுயிர்துறந்தவள்ளல்
தூயவன்மைந்தனே நீ பரதன்முன்தோன்றினுயே."
(76-வாலிவதை.)

வாலியைப்படுத் தாயலமன்னற
வேலியைப்படுத்தாய் விறல்வீரனே (89-ibid).

When Hanuman returns from Lunka he bows and says to Rama anxiously awaiting his message " கண்டனன் கற்பினுக்கணியை கண்களால்" (58-திருவடிதொழுத படலம் Sundarakandam). Note how appropriate the order is. Rama would be in suspense thinking whether Hanuman found Seeta. In order to remove this suspense, he opens his sentence with கண்டனன். As soon as Rama hears this, he would further be in suspense about her chastity. Hanuman, therefore, adds next (கண்டனன்) கற்பினுக்கணியை (the ornament of chastity). In such places, disturb the order of words, the whole effect will vanish.

While Rama and Seeta were approaching the பஞ்சவடி on the banks of the Godavery, they are both made to exhibit very pretty humour :—Rama, finding chakravala birds there, looked at Seeta's breast: Seeta, intent on his shoulders, looked at the adjoining beautiful hillocks. Rama who looked at the swans turned his eyes towards Seeta's steps and made a smile: Seeta who looked at the elephants which went away after quenching their thirst turned her eyes towards Rama's steps and smiled also. Rama saw the creepers on the banks of the river and gazed at Seeta's waist: Seeta saw lotus blossoms amidst a forest of blue lotus and gazed at the whole form of Rama. This humour and playful fancy is most appropriate and has a dramatic effect as their separation is approaching.

Kamban makes a very superfluous use of தற்குறிப்பேற்றம் (Reflection on natural occurrences), and it peculiarly befits his description of the dawn after Kaikeyi's conspiracy (which we explain here as a striking example of this usage). The matron of darkness, finding the deed of Kaikeyi who did not sympathise with the misery of her husband though she had been acting all along as though she were his life, went away as if she were ashamed of even standing before her. The fowls indicating the hour of dawn seemed to beat their winged hands over their breasts unable to bear the lamentation of Dasaratha all the night long. The starry heaven which formed as it were a canopy of pearls for the installation ceremony of Rama vanished having known that the ceremony was put off. We will cite another instance. Just after the ministers had consented about the propriety of raising Rama to the throne, Dasaratha sends for him, and on his approach embraces him. The poet adds .—What beauty is there in saying that the father embraced his son? In order that he might judge of the capability of the son to bear the sovereignty of the world, he measured the breast and shoulders of his son with his own breast and shoulders.

*Kamban versus Valmiki.*—Such are some of the beauties we have gathered with some difficulty. To choose a beauty where beauties abound is a laborious task. After all it may be said that the Tamil Ramayan is not an indigenous production but only after the Sanskrit original. A very cursory examination of the Sanskrit original and the Tamil imitation will convince any one that Kamban has not made a verbatim translation of Valmiki. The bare plot of Valmiki is all that Kamban borrows. Bishop Caldwel says that "the difference between the Tamil and Sanskrit Ramayan may be compared to the difference between Pope's Iliad and the Iliad of Homer." Kamban even makes bold to slightly change the plot in his own way. We compared the Tamil Ramayan with the first two kandams of Valmiki in Dutt's translation, and noted that all the first portions (which are believed to be interpolations by western scholars) are very dexterously omitted by Kamban. Dasaratha consults his ministers in regular assemblies about what may be done for securing a son. They advice this and that sacrifice. Sumanthiran says in private to the king of what he heard from Sanatkumara, and Dasaratha then learns that Kalaikkottu Maharishi is indispensable for conducting the sacrifice. But Kamban in the very opening of the story makes Vasishta to muse upon the divine mystery and to hint to the king the procedure to be adopted. The Kalaikkottu Rishi of Valmiki is dealt with as an ordinary personage. But that Rishi in the hands of Kamban commands the awe and respect of the reader. The message to Dasaratha of Rama's marriage is all narrated by Valmiki in a short compass. But Kamban makes undue expansion here. He allots one whole chapter to the march of the imperial army and four chapters to their riotous revellings on their way. In the second kanda Valmiki goes on narrating like a garrulous old man. It is in this kandam that Kamban is most dramatic. Valmiki's account of

packing Rama to the desert is most tedious. But Kamban makes Kaikeyi call Rama and give him his father's injunctions. Rama straightway takes leave of his own mother and his younger aunt who ordains Lakshmana to accompany and serve Rama. Seeta troubles Rama that she will also accompany him to the woods. Sumanthira is ordered to take them in a chariot and leave them in the near forest. Valmiki makes Dasaratha and his wife see Rama driving in the chariot till his head disappears, and this is omitted by Kamban with the intention of producing an impression on the reader that the horror of the news when brought by Sumanthiran was unbearable by Dasaratha and he expired immediately. We find from such comparisons that Kamban where he varies from the plot of Valmiki varies with a purpose. He either gives a dramatic coloring to his variations or puts a stronger epic impression upon them. Like Valmiki, he has not mentioned anything of the Saiva baptism of Rama by Agasthya, though other authors of Athyathmaka Ramayan and puranas are strong upon the point. Kamban's Iranyapadalam in the Yuthakanda is certainly his interpolation. His object in putting it in the mouth of Vibhishana must be raising Rama in the estimation of Ravana. His execution of this episode is so masterly that even should the other portions of his Ramayan be destroyed that single chapter would be enough to give evidence of the master hand as a poet and an epic poet too. His sentiments and language and spirit are so strong there. In his paper on Tamil Literature in the *Calcutta Review* page 159, July No. 1855, Vol. XXV, the Rev Bower of Madras says :—"We have read both Valmiki and Kamban, and at times we were at a loss to know to which of the poets the palm of victory was to be assigned. Valmiki is diffuse and simple. Kamban abridges but elaborates. There is a profusion of ornament at times, here and there, abounding in beautiful touches of expression."

*Kamban judged by the canons of Aristotle.*—Even when judged by the canons of Aristotle, in their fourfold classification of the fable, the characters, sentiments and the language, in reviewing an Epic, Kamban does not fall short of any of the requirements. The fable with its episodes and the characters are the partially historical and partially mythical creations of Valmiki. The sentiments and the language of the Tamil Ramayana are Kamban's own. Except in some places where Seeta abuses the Rakshasas, and the Rakshasas abuse the monkeys and their manly masters, there is no vulgarity to be traced anywhere. We have already noted the fine sentiments of Kamban and also the beautiful language in which he couches them. His style always carries a majesty with it. An experienced scholar after one reading can distinguish between the verses of the *Ramayan* and the *Chinthamany* even, if they should be shuffled together in confusion. Another beauty of Kamban's style is that the sound and the sense are always in harmony. You can regularly dance at a joyous passage and weep at a pathetic passage.

*The strength and capability of the genius of Kamban.*—We believe in the anecdote that Kamban, when asked how far he had composed his Ramayan, while in fact he had not even invoked the muse, answered that he was going on with சேதுபந்தனப்படலம், whereas his brother poet was actually going on with கடறாவுபடலம். He was conscious of the wonderful power of his genius and was sure that he could overtake ஒட்டக்கூத்தர் in a few days, and he did so in one fortnight. Every page of Ramayan shows the author who only took care of his thoughts and whose words had to take care of themselves. There is not one line which is laboured. He had not to press his forehead for a simile. His knowledge of the world and acquaintance with literature were very wide. Being of the middle age his practical experience was ripe and he did "his best thing easiest" as Emerson would say. We will parody Emerson and say "Kamban's principle may be conveyed, in saying that he, of all men, best understands the *Tamil* language, and can say what he will." That he did compose the சேதுபந்தனப்படலம் at a moment's notice in the royal court we cannot doubt. The incident contained in this chapter was so fresh in his mind that it served as a simile in the 9th stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம்.

மலையெடுத்து மரங்கள் பறித்து மா
மலைமுதற் பொருள் யாவையு மேந்தலான்
அலைகடற் றலையன் றணை வேண்டிய
நிலையுடைக் கவி நீத்தமந் நீத்தமே.

*His other works*:—The genius of Kamban had its full play only in the Ramayan. His சடகோபரந்தாதி is the only other work which shows a master hand. His சரஸ்வதியந்தாதி was perhaps his juvenile composition. It does not bear the stamp of a ripe and strong intellect. In fact it has not the excellence of சகலகலாவல்லி மாலை of குமரகுருபரர் of recent date. He

actually believed no doubt that a daily adoration to the Muse strengthened the talents and powers of a poet.

> படிக நிறமும் பவளச்செவ் வாயுங்
> கடிகமழ்பூந் தாமரைபோற் கையும்—துடியிடையும்
> அல்லும் பகலும் அநவரத முந்துதித்தால்
> கல்லுஞ்சொல் லாதோ கவி.

T. CHELVAKESAVAROYA MUDALIAR, M. A.

(*To be Continued*).

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Wrote Dr. Johnson to his friend Boswell, "Whatever philosophy may determine of material nature, it is certainly true of intellectual nature that it *abhors* a vacuum: *Our minds cannot be empty*; and evil will break in upon them, if they are not preoccupied by good. My dear sir, mind your studies, mind your business, make your lady happy and be a good Christian."

We came across the passage a few days ago; and after what we wrote about the nature of the *Satasat*, we were not a little surprised. Our old pundits used to express the same truth more popularly when commenting on the necessity why our Good Mother *Avvei* enjoined "நல்லாரைக் காண்பதுவும் நன்றே, &c." "To visit the Good is good &c" immediately after laying down, "தீயாரைக் காண்பதுவும் தீதே, &c." "To visit the wicked is bad, &c." We admire also the sage and most practical advice contained in the last line of Dr. Johnson quoted above.

***

We are glad to welcome the first number of the Re-Awakened India or Prabuddha Bharata, under the new management, and in a new form, the reason for which is explained in the editorial. The present contains a short notice of the passing away of Pawhari Baba of Ghazipur, on 10th June last who is said to have been a very pious Saint and Yogi.

***

It is a well-known fact how unscrupulous Vaishnava editors generally are when editing well-known ancient classical works both in Tamil and in Sanskrit. A Reviewer of Bengali Literature, brought out the fact in a late number of the *Calcutta Review*, how in all modern editions and renderings of ancient Puranic and Itikasa writings, all reference to Siva and Sakti were being studiously omitted. In the September number of the '*Theosophist*' a correspondent noticing a new edition of Mahabarata in Devanagari Type by V. Ramanujachariar, Proprietor, L. H. Press, Coleroon, S. I. R., states as follows. "In 1896, some gentlemen of Tanjore District, Madras Presidency, associated themselves together to bring out a Grantha edition of Bharata; they finished the first five parvas or cantos. The editor of the present edition was one of them, but as he would not consent to the others *striking out some stanzas in support of the Saivite and the Sakta system of faith, and putting in other stanzas of their own composition in praise of Vishnu*, he severed the connection and established a press of his own at Coleroon, to bring out the complete text in Devanagari letters."

***

Such things are going on almost every day, and when we sent a copy an old Sanskrit manuscript obtained from the Tanjore Library, our Pundit was horrified to find how the text was mutilated here and there and badly interpolated with expressions and sentences which could not by any possibility have come from the original author's lips. What an uproar would have been raised in Europe if even the most harmless liberties of the kind were taken by editors. Unfortunately in India there is no proper press criticism of such misdeeds and no effective public opinion, and when anybody says the least offensive things against such misdeeds he is easily put down for a sectarian bigot.! In the case of Mahabharata, the texts began to be interpolated long ago, and Dr. Lassen has noted down in various places the texts probably interpolated: And Srilasri S. Somasundara Nayagar called attention to the fact how, in the edition of Villiputtûrar's Bharata (Tamil) many stanzas were omitted wholesale and how other minor alterations were made in the texts.

***

WE have received an unauthenticated communication, signed 'A critic,' taking exception, to our notice of the 'Life of Her Majesty' of the *Vivekachintamani* series and containing an enumeration of errors in language and diction contained in the book. There was however nothing very extravagant in our praise of the book, and the criticism is also very unfair and prejudiced and, nay, incorrect too. For instance where he objects to redundancy in expressions like 'பல்கிப்பெருகி,' and where he says 'வள்ளுவர்' (heralds) is misspelt for 'வல்லுவர்,' and goes on to compare the mistake to that of the printer who made J. S. Mill the greatest *drinker* of the age. Why we know a recent performance of a great functionary and scholar who translated a Vedanta treatise entitled "பசு சச்சிதானந்தமுடையதா" into "are *cows* happy." (not a printer's mistake surely). The critic however objects to the use of unfamiliar Sanskrit words, and with unusual spelling and to the free use of foreign words though in colloquial use, and some other mistakes, with perhaps greater justice. But it must be remembered at the same time, that the writer is a Brahmin and a graduate and who could not have acquired much freedom in

the use of pure classical Tamil. But our own experience of what is called pure classical style, approved of, for instance, by the Editor of the *Gnanabodhini* is also disappointing. There is no harm in introducing colloquial foreign words if they are effective and otherwise indispensable. As the new school of Indian Tamil graduates are not altogether writing for the vulgar, they should also take care that they do not altogether drift into slang; though a certain amount of freedom and lightness is altogether essential in such compositions.

***

Says the *Indian Social Reformer*:—

"As for Agastya, who is said to have perfected Tamil, being a Brahman, we would advise our contemporary not to accept these things too literally. Who is this Agastya who is said to have done so much for the Tamil language? Certainly not the Agastya the reputed author of several hymns in the 1st Mandala of the Rig Veda, in one of which he figures in the odious light of the old husband of young Lopamudra. It so happens that Lopamudra is a name for the river Cauvery, and if we adopt the credulity of the *Siddhanta Deepika*, there can be nothing more easy than to give the Southern Rishi a southern wife. It is, however, more in consonance with established facts to believe that Lopamudra was adopted long after the vedic times as the name of the Cauvery, suggested it may be by the name of the southernmost star known to Hindu astronomy, Agastya, which the Greeks called Canopus. Nothing is more natural than that a pastoral and agricultural people like the ancient Aryans should distinguish a people as the children of the star under which and the river on whose banks they dwelt. We are inclined to believe that the Agastya of the Tamil language is a mere myth, meaning no more than that the language flourished in the country which lay in the direction, and, therefore, according to old-world views, under the protection, of the star, Agastya. It was the settled policy of the Brahmans to give everything they came in contact with a Brahmanical pedigree, provided it was not absolutely licentious or revoltingly inhuman."

Well, according to our learned contemporary the 'Tamil Agastya' was no person, much less a Brahmin, was a mere myth, and was the name of the Southern Asterism. We would ask him for his authority for saying so; and in what old book of the Brahmans or the Tamils is this fact recorded. We thought our contemporary found fault frequently with Revivalists and Reactionaries for giving explanations for facts and practices other than those denoted by them.

***

We are sorry to say our contemporary has not grasped the true way of reading ancient Itikasa and tradition in India. Valuable suggestions on this point were thrown out by Sir Alfred Lyall and Dr. Leituer at the discussion which ensued on the reading of Mr. Sewell's paper "India before the English." And then there is another way of regarding these traditions and legends and which is suggested by such a great historian as the late J. A. Froude. He says, in his book *Oceana*, page 69.—

"Where were the lines which divided truth from falsehood in the mind of Alcinous? The words of Ulysses had *form*. Organic form is possible only when there is life and so the problem returns which so often haunts us. What is truth? The apple falls by gravitation. Whether Newton ever watched an apple fall and drew his inference in consequence, has nothing to do with the universal reality which remains unaltered if the rest is a legend. The story of the apple is the shell. The truth is the kernel or thing signified. Sacred history in like manner, busy only to convey spiritual truth, is careless as Alcinous of inquiring into fact. It takes fact or legend or whatever comes to hand and weaves it into form. The beauty of the form, and the spirit which animates the form, are the guarantees of truth and carry their witness in themselves. Thus we are rid for ever of critical controversies. The spirit is set free from the letter and we can breathe and believe in peace. Two good news to be true! Perhaps so. In a long voyage where we can do nothing but read and reflect such thoughts come like shadows upon water when it is untouched by the breeze (இலையசையா நீர்). The air ruffles it again and they are gone."

So what we conclude about Agastya is, though we never said he was the Agastya of the Vedas, 'the odious husband of young Lopamudra' (though as a matter of fact young wives run away from their young and beautiful husbands and sometimes shoot them dead too), yet nearly all the Puranas and Itikasas written by Aryan Brahmans attest Agastya's sojourn in the south, and the very first Tamil work written by a Brahman, author of Tolkappiyam refers to him in the following verse.

"ஆதியிற்றமிழ்நூல் அகத்தியர்க்குணர்த்திய
மாதொருபாகனை வழுத்துதும்
போதமெய்ஞ்ஞான நலம்பெறற்பொருட்டே."

and the same tradition is preserved in several other important works. Agastya is believed to be the author of the first work in grammar "*பேரகத்தியம்*" a work believed to be lost now, and Agastya is always spoken of as the Tamil Muni; as such Agastya was probably a well-known historical figure, connected with the very first settlement of North Indian Aryans into the Tamil land, and who soon after their settlement, identified themselves completely with the Tamil people for centuries, (and so we have the fact that till the time of Nilakanta and Sankara we have very few Sanskrit works of any importance composed in Southern India; and even if Agastya was not a Brahman and was a mere myth, the traditions connected with him are enough for our purpose to show the feeling of social unity which prevailed in those times between the Aryans and Tamils. Gnana Sambantha of the Kaundinya Gotra (a Vedic Gotra by the way) always calls himself very frequently 'Tamil Gnana Sambanthan'; but perhaps our contemporary will say he was no Brahmin and was a myth also.

***

*In memoriam* :—We regret to record the passing away of Pundit Venkataramana Dass of Sâmakulam, Coimbatore, on 11th August last. He belongs to a Vaishnava family of the Sholiya sect and his family members were heriditary archakas of the Vishnu temple of the same village. He learnt Sanskrit in his youth under one Appulinga Sastri and but his proficiency in the Tamil language was more or less self-acquired, though he received some finishing from Pundit Kandasami Mudaliar of Coimbatore. In early life he was helped by some local magnates, and subsequently he got engaged in a Bajanakutam on a small salary. During this period and latterly he spent his time mostly in preaching and in literary work. The pages of *Brahma Vidhya*, *Nagai Nilalochani*, *Viveka Diwakaran* and a number of other vernacular journals were frequently enriched from his contributions, and he was a powerful writer and speaker. He has published an innumerable number of pamphlets and books and his *Thirupandi Kodumudi Puranam* is spoken of highly. We met him while returning from the Maharaja Setupati of Ramnad loaded with a present of Rs. 500, and he expressed to us his great gratification and gratefulness to the Maharajah. He lived a life of extreme purity, and piety and simplicity and extreme contentment. He got from the Maharaja of Ramnad the title of *Valiakaliyuga Haradatta* on account of his great proficiency in the Saiva Siddhanta Shastras and adherence to the faith. All the vernacular journals feel his irreparable to themselves and to the public. He has left behind him a father, 2 sons and 3 daughters, in rather a precarious condition.

***

The *Madras Mail* in reviewing the series of articles contributed by Mr. C. V. Swaminatha Aiyar on *Vernacular Studies*, concludes as follows :—

"Now for a practical suggestion, to finish up with. The people of this Presidency, we mean the vernacular-speaking people, want books to read. At present this literature is limited in quantity and rashy in quality. Why should not a big society, consisting of the wealthiest and most enlightened men of this Presidency, be formed for the "propagation of vernacular literature?" There is no lack of money in the country, and the men who possess it have not shown themselves backward in helping on philanthrophic schemes, and there is little doubt that this support would be forthcoming. The business of the society, when duly furnished with funds, would be to employ educated men to translate suitable English books into the vernaculars, and, if possible, to compose original works. We are convinced there would be no lack of men to do this; men who are capable, and who would be only too glad of the opportunity of making a few hundred rupees in this way. Besides, they would get *Kudas* too. The society would publish the books at its own risk, but if the people are as anxious for something to read as we are just now being led to suppose, there would not be much risk about it. An incalculable amount of good might be done in this way. The masses would be supplied with sound and healthy reading, the vernaculars would be improved, and the necessary stimulus and encouragement given for their study. And, what is more, it would in all probability, pay, and there seems to be no reason why, in time such a society should not have its book depôts in every town in the Presidency. And above all, it would be done by the people's unaided efforts, without the help of Governments, or Universities, or any other official corporations. The thing only wants organising. The money, we are convinced, is ready at hand; the working material, if scanty at first, would increase to supply the demand. There seems to us to be an opening here for individual effort and public spirit. The men who could organise such a society as this, would be doing much for their countrymen and for posterity."

***

We are glad to congratulate Mrs. Annie Besant on her achievement in establishing a *Central Hindu College* at Benares. The College was opened on 7th July last, with Ganesha Puja and Homam &c. There are two European and two Indian Professors, and one Head Sanskrit Pandit in the staff. The fees are fixed very low—one Rupee a month in the School and two Rupees a month in the College.

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. NAGARATNAM.